



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,713	02/28/2002	Jeffrey Scott Weaver	10010089-1	1736

7590 03/10/2006
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

RUDOLPH, VINCENT M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/085,713	WEAVER, JEFFREY SCOTT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vincent M. Rudolph	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Terminal Disclaimer

The terminal disclaimer received on 12/19/2005 has been accepted for the provisional double patenting rejection. Since the applicant's amendment overcame the non-provisional double patenting rejection, a terminal disclaimer is not needed at this time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christopher ('528).

Regarding claim 1, Christopher ('528) discloses enabling features of a printing device (optional operations within the printing device, See Col. 8, Line 50-54) and includes receiving information to be printed such that the printing device is enabled to print the information regardless if a first feature of the printing device is enabled or not (the information that is to be printed is received, See Col. 6, Line 35-43, even though some optional features are not enabled, See Col. 8, Line 50-54). The printer then receives and retrieves the designation of the first feature of the printing device the user wants to enable so that the printer enables the feature when outputting the document (a

Art Unit: 2624

user selects which features of the printer to enable, See Col. 1, Line 54-60, so that the outputted image includes the designated features, See Col. 5, Line 52-54).

Christopher ('528) does not disclose receiving information corresponding to an authorization of a user, but it is known in the art to let only authorized users change certain settings. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receive a type of authorization information, such as a password or a pin number, in order to enable a feature within the printer. For instance, an administrator, once authorized, is able to set and restrict certain features the users are and are not allowed to enable. By doing this, the administrator is able to oversee how the printer is used in order to prevent unauthorized users from enabling a feature that could jeopardize the functionality of the printer.

Regarding claim 18, the rationale provided in the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein. In addition, the method of claim 1 corresponds to the computer readable medium of claim 18 and additionally Christopher ('528) discloses a computer readable medium used with a printing device with logic (See Col. 8, Line 50-54).

Regarding claim 8, Christopher ('528) discloses the information to enable the first feature is stored by the printing device (within the RAM, See Figure 2, Element 204; Col. 6, Line 30-35).

Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christopher ('528) in view of Francis ('430).

Regarding claim 3, Christopher ('528) does not disclose providing a user authorization tag in order to verify the user.

Francis ('430) discloses providing an authorization tag (identification card) that includes the information to enable printing of a specialized print panel, which is done in proximity of the printing device (See Figure 2; Col. 1, Line 53-Col. 2, Line 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to include a user authorization tag, such as the one disclosed by Francis ('430), and incorporate it into the printer of Christopher ('528) because if the data is to be encrypted or is classified, authorizing the user prior to printing verifies the person's identity and allows the printing process.

Regarding claim 4, Christopher ('528) does not disclose determining whether the information relating to authorizing the user is received, and if it is not, discontinue printing of the information.

Francis ('430) discloses if a smart-card is used for printing, the printer determines whether information relating the authorization of the user is received, which validates the identity of the user (See Col. 1, Line 66-Col. 2, Line 8). This process is discontinued, which includes the first feature or enabling the chosen printer, if the information relating to the authorization of the user is not received, or not validated (it prevents access if there is no match between the password in the printer memory and the password in the smart-card, See Col. 1, Line 66-Col. 2, Line 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to include a determining factor regarding the authorization of the user, such as the one disclosed within Francis ('430), and incorporate it into the

printer of Christopher ('528) because it prevents unauthorized users from trying to gain access to classified or encrypted data and attempt to print it.

Claims 5-7, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christopher ('528) in view of Mazzagatte ('583).

Regarding claim 5, Christopher ('528) discloses accessing and retrieving the data to enables optional features within the printing device (the EEPROM, See Figure 4, Element 222; Col. 8, Line 50-54).

Christopher ('528) does not disclose accessing and retrieving the information to enable the first feature from a storage medium outside the printing device.

Mazzagatte ('583) discloses retrieving the information for enabling the first feature (See Col. 9, Line 25-34). This includes accessing a storage medium to the printing device for obtaining the identification information such as over the internet (See Col. 8, Line 37-40). The information is then retrieved, or downloaded, from the storage medium and adapted to enable the first feature of the printing device, which is submitted with the print job (See Col. 8, Line 40-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to include a storage medium, such as the one disclosed by Mazzagatte ('583) and incorporate it into the printer of Christopher ('528) because by having an additional storage medium outside the printing device, it is able to be used for backup storage if the internal storage malfunctions or crashes.

Regarding claim 6, Christopher ('528) does not disclose that the storage medium is a Web site.

Mazzagatte ('583) discloses the storage medium is a web site, which is over the internet, to download the information to the computer (See Col. 8, Line 37-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have the storage medium in a Web site, such as the internet as disclosed by Mazzagatte ('583) and incorporate it into the printer of Christopher ('528) because the information is able to be downloaded to the computer from the internet and submitted with the print job (See Mazzagatte, Col. 8, Line 40-42).

Regarding claim 7, Christopher ('528) does not disclose providing the storage medium.

Mazzagatte ('583) discloses the internet provides a storage medium, thus allowing the user to download the information to the computer and submit with the print job (See Col. 8, Line 37-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to provide the storage medium within a Web site, such as the internet as disclosed by Mazzagatte ('583) and incorporate it into the printer of Christopher ('528) because the information is able to be downloaded to the computer from the internet and submitted with the print job (See Mazzagatte, Col. 8, Line 40-42).

Regarding claim 19, Christopher ('528) does not disclose logic to access a Web site and retrieve the information in order to enable the first feature from a Web site.

Mazzagatte ('583) discloses a logic configured to access a Web site, such as over the internet, and retrieve, or download, the information (See Col. 8, Line 37-42) to enable the first feature from the site (See Col. 9, Line 31-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to access the Web site and retrieve the information to enable the first feature, such as disclosed by Mazzagatte ('583) and incorporate it into the printer of Christopher ('528) because the information is able to be retrieved and downloaded to the computer from the internet and submitted with the print job to enable the feature (See Mazzagatte, Col. 8, Line 40-42).

Regarding claim 21, the rationale provided in the rejection of claim 4 is incorporated herein. In addition, the method of claim 4 corresponds to the computer readable medium of claim 21 (See Col. 8, Line 50-54) and performs the steps disclosed.

Claim 9 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christopher ('528) in view of Mazzagatte ('583) as applied to claims 1 and 18 and further in view of Bolash ('041).

Regarding claim 9, Christopher ('528) does not disclose receiving identification information corresponding to a print cartridge of the printing device, determine if it is associated with the printing device, and if not, notifying the user.

Bolash ('041) discloses receiving identification information corresponding to a print cartridge of the printing device and determines whether the identification information corresponding to the print cartridge is associated with the printing device, such as determining if the appropriate type of print cartridge is installed (See Col. 4, Line 32-36). If this information does not correspond to the print cartridge of the printing device, an error message is displayed to notify the user the print cartridge is not associated with the printing device (See Col. 4, Line 43-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have information relating to a print cartridge for a printing device, such as the one disclosed by Bolash ('041) incorporated into Christopher ('528) because whenever a user is authorized to print using the selected printer, if an error, such as incorrectly installing the wrong cartridge, occurred, the user is notified to make the proper changes to be able to print out the document.

Regarding claim 20, the rationale provided in the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated herein. In addition, the method of claim 9 corresponds to the computer readable medium of claim 20 (See Col. 8, Line 50-54) and performs the steps disclosed.

Claims 10 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christopher ('528) in view of Hebert ('505).

Regarding claim 10, Christopher ('528) discloses a print system (See Figure 2) with a printing device having a first print cartridge, which contains a print substance such as ink to print onto a print medium (a print head, See Figure 1, Element 45; Col. 3, Line 15-17). The print system also has an enabling features of a printing device (optional operations within the printing device, See Col. 8, Line 50-54) and includes receiving information to be printed such that the printing device is enabled to print the information regardless if a first feature of the printing device is enabled or not (the information that is to be printed is received, See Col. 6, Line 35-43, even though some optional features are not enabled, See Col. 8, Line 50-54). The printer then receives and retrieves information corresponding to an authorization of a user and the designation of the first feature of the printing device the user wants to enable so that the

Art Unit: 2624

printer enables the feature when outputting the document (a user selects which features of the printer to enable, See Col. 1, Line 54-60, so that the outputted image includes the designated features, See Col. 5, Line 52-54).

Christopher ('528) does not disclose a printing device having an identification reader and a readable identification tag that is in the print cartridge to provide the first information. The identification reader receives the first information from the identification tag, and if it corresponds to the printing device, the reader enables the printing device to print.

Herbert ('505) discloses a printing device for using an identification tag, or a smart device (See Figure 1), on a cartridge (See Figure 2) to communicate with a sensor port (See Figure 1, Element 30) connected to the identification reader, or a microprocessor (See Figure 1, Element 10). The identification reader, or microprocessor, receives the first information, or data, from the identification tag, or the smart device, and if this data corresponds to the correctly and recognized by the microprocessor, it enables the printing device to print (See Col. 4, Line 9-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have the an identification tag on a cartridge disclosed by Herbert ('505) and incorporated into the print system of Christopher ('528) because this ensures the print cartridges are correctly used by the authorized user.

Regarding claim 16, Christopher ('528) discloses a print system (See Figure 2) with a printing device having a first print cartridge, which contains a print substance

such as ink to print onto a print medium (a print head, See Figure 1, Element 45; Col. 3, Line 15-17).

Christopher ('528) does not disclose having a second print cartridge, which is installed in the printing device after the first cartridge is removed, with a readable identification tag for providing the first information.

Herbert ('505) discloses a second print cartridge is needed after the ink supply of the first is empty (See Col. 3, Line 60-62). The second print cartridge also contains a readable identification tag for providing the first information, or data, correctly (Col. 3, Line 67-Col. 4, Line 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have the an identification tag on a second cartridge disclosed by Herbert ('505) and incorporated into the print system of Christopher ('528) because this ensures that more print cartridges are correctly used by the authorized user after one is removed from the printing device.

Regarding claim 17, Christopher ('528) discloses a print system (See Figure 2).

Christopher ('528) does not disclose the first feature can be a half-toning algorithm, a font, a digital signature or a photo algorithm.

It would have been obvious to have the user, once authorized, print out a document with a first feature being font because it was the type chosen in the application prior to being processed. So, the font being printed is the same that was chosen before information was being received corresponding to the authorization of the user.

Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christopher ('528) in view of Hebert ('505) as applied to claim 10 and further in view of Mazzagatte ('583).

Regarding claim 11, Christopher ('528) does not disclose the identification reader includes a receiver to authorize to user using a wireless communication.

Mazzagatte ('583) discloses a print system having an identification reader that includes a receiver, such as a smart-card reader (See Figure 1, Element 15), which receives information relating to the authorization of the user using a wireless communication, such as inserting the smart card into the smart card reader (See Col. 8, Line 30-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have included the wireless receiver, such as the one disclosed by Mazzagatte ('583), and incorporate it into the print system of Christopher ('528) because it allows a user the ability to not have to enter anything and instead use an identification card to verify and authorize the user.

Regarding claim 12, Christopher ('528) does not disclose receiving the information using a wireless communication.

Mazzagatte ('583) discloses a print system having an identification reader that includes a means for receiving the information using a wireless communication, such as inserting the smart-card into the smart-card reader (See Col. 9, Line 52-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have means for receiving data wirelessly, such as the one

Art Unit: 2624

disclosed by Mazzagatte ('583), and incorporate it into the print system of Christopher ('528) because it allows a user the ability to not have to enter anything and instead use an identification card to verify and authorize the user.

Regarding claim 13, Christopher ('528) does not disclose a user authorization tag, which includes memory relating to information to authorize the user, to communicate with the identification reader via a wireless communication.

Mazzagatte ('583) discloses a print system having a user authorization tag, or a unique identification information contained on a smart-card, used to communicate with the identification reader, such as a smart-card reader (See Col. 9, Line 52-55). When obtained, the user authorization tag has the information stored in a memory located within the smart-card in digital form which is supplied to the computer through the smart-card interface (See Col. 9, Line 46-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have a user authorization tag, such as the one disclosed by Mazzagatte ('583), and incorporate it into the print system of Christopher ('528) because it allows a user the ability to not have to enter anything and have the identification information stored on the card to verify and authorize the user.

Regarding claim 14, Christopher ('528) does not disclose having the user authorization tag configured to retrieve the information in order to enable the first feature of the printing device.

Mazzagatte ('583) discloses a print system with a user authorization tag, or a unique identification information, that includes data for the feature-enabling system, or

smart-card reader, to retrieve the information (See Col. 9, Line 52-55) and enable the first feature of the printing device, which is what printer to output the information to (See Col. 9, Line 31-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have a user authorization tag to enable the first feature of the printing device, such as the one disclosed by Mazzagatte ('583), and incorporate it into the print system of Christopher ('528) because it allows a user the ability to not have to enter anything physically to authorize the user prior to printing and instead have the identification information stored on the card to verify the identity of the user.

Regarding claim 15, Christopher ('528) does not disclose having the user authorization tag include a uniform resources locator relating to the information in order to enable the first feature of the printing device.

Mazzagatte ('583) discloses a print system where the user authorization tag, or a unique identification information, includes a uniform resources locator, such as an internet site, corresponding to the information to submit with the print job (See Col. 8, Line 37-42) and enable the first feature of the printing device, such as what printer to output the information to (See Col. 9, Line 31-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have included a URL within the user authorization tag, such as the one disclosed by Mazzagatte ('583) and incorporate it into the print system of Christopher ('528) because a URL, such as a database, is able to store the user information and retrieve the user authorization so it is processed more quickly.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christopher ('528) in view of Lee ('027).

Regarding claim 22, Christopher ('528) does not disclose having a first feature being a half-toning algorithm.

Lee ('027) discloses having a user adjust the half-toning algorithm (i.e. a gray scale from white to black, See Col. 3, Line 31-34). By adjusting the density level of the printer, a user is able to change the brightness setting, either darker or lighter, for the printer output (See Col. 4, Line 24-32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by the applicant to have a half-toning algorithm, such as the one disclosed by Lee ('027) and incorporate it into the print system of Christopher ('528) because by allowing a half-toning algorithm as a first feature, a user is able to customize the density setting for the document in order to set it to one's preference.

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues that Mazzagatte ('583) does not disclose printing even if a first feature is not enabled. Even though Mazzagatte ('583) does not fully disclose this limitation, Christopher ('528) does meet the claimed invention. For instance, Christopher ('528) discloses that a user is able to enable and disable optional features prior to printing (See Col. 1, Line 60-68). Even though some features are disabled, they are optional, so they do not affect the printing regardless if one feature is enabled or not. Thus, Christopher ('528) is able to meet the limitations disclosed.

Based on these facts, this action is made final.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure is: Ikegami ('000).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vincent M. Rudolph whose telephone number is (571) 272-8243. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8 A.M. - 4:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly A. Williams can be reached on (571) 272-7471. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

VMR
3/1/06

Vincent M. Rudolph
Examiner
Art Unit 2624


MARK ZIMMERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600